Debt Collector, here Guglielmo & Associates, is to <u>send</u> the letter notifying the Debtors of their rights, and that there is absolutely no further obligation to ensure that it is received by the debtors, and thus no tolling of the 30 day time period to account for when they checked their mail. *Mahon* v. *Credit Bureau of Placer County Incorporated*, 171 f.3d 1197 (9th CA 1999), applying the Mail Box Rule to 1692(g) disputes. This dispute originates from the Defendant's independent decision not to have their mail delivered to their residence, or to check their Post Office Box regularly, neither of which constitutes a bad act or omission by Guglielmo & Associates.

Therefore, as there is no basis of legal liability for the acts of which the Gurules complain there is also no way they could. As to their arguments regarding overshadowing, this proposed claim is subject to the same analysis: Guglielmo and Associates were under an obligation to send the notice, and to refrain from undercutting or overshadowing the rights of the Gurules within that 30 day period. It is undisputed that Guglielmo & Associates took no collection actions during the 30 day period. As the facts are before the Court, pled by the Defendants, and not a byproduct of notice pleading or legal claims analysis, Guglielmo & Associates respectfully request the dismissal of the action with prejudice to prevent vexatious litigation.

II. ROOKER FELDMAN DOCTRINE

The intent of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine is to prevent unhappy state court litigants from filing suit in Federal District Court, creating a *de facto* appeal of the state court action. *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923), *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983). The Gurules here argue this is a "collateral attack" on the state court judgment, and it is the state court judgment which is "void ab initio." As the State Court has concurrent jurisdiction with the federal court actions over the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act, 15 USC 1692, this claim falls squarely under the Rooker Feldman doctrine. In their argument, the Gurules admit to having

\$\text{\partial} \text{ase 2:10-cv-02029-KJD -GWF Document 10 Filed 01/19/11 Page 3 of 3

1 commenced parallel litigation in an attempt to undo an anticipated loss in state court on the 2 merits, and a loss on their counterclaim. Exxon Mobile Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp. 544 3 US 280 (2005), Johnson v. de Grandy, 512 US 997, (1994). Therefore, Plaintiff respectfully 4 requests that the Plaintiff's Complaint be DISMISSED, WITH PREJUDICE. DATED 5 01/17/2011. 6 7 **GUGLIELMO & ASSOCIATES** 8 /s/ R. Ohlinger Original Signature 9 Skluge 10 11 Roberta Ohlinger 12 Nevada Bar #10946 13 3376 S Eastern Avenue Ste 188-A Las Vegas NV 89169 14 (702)889-6009 15 Attorney for Defendant Guglielmo & Associates 16 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 17 I hereby certify that on this 17th day of January 2011, I served the foregoing REPLY TO 18 19 OPPOSITION by depositing a true copy thereof into the U.S. Mails, postage prepaid and 20 addressed to the following at their last known addresses: 21 22 Darci Gurule Erick Acacio Gurule 23 Po Box 97551 Las Vegas NV 89193-7551 24 /s/ R. Ohlinger 25 26 27

28